

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 2-11, 13-20 and 22-24 are pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 5, 15 and 22 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,583,543 to Takahashi et al. (“Takahashi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,831 to Beernink (“Beernink”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,442 to Edwards et al. (“Edwards”). . The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,009 to Lui et al. (“Lui”). The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,546,538 to Cobbley et al. (“Cobbley”). The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,760,773 to Berman et al. (“Berman”). The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143831 to Bennett (“Bennett”). The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in further view of Cobbley. The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in view of Berman. The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink and Lui in view of Bennett. The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,888 to Marianetti et al. (“Marianetti”).

Claims 3, 5 and 9:

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Beernink in view of Edwards. Applicant has amended independent claim 5 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 5 has been amended to recite the step of “moving the insertion point and the scroll control area in unison to the left.”

The present invention, as recited in independent claim 5, is directed to a method for handwriting recognition on a portable computer system where text input strokes are accepted in a first touchscreen area, and recognized text is displayed in the second touchscreen area. A portion of the recognized text is also displayed in the first touchscreen area in a scrolling fashion. The first touchscreen area is configured for recognizing input strokes as text input and the second touchscreen area is configured for recognizing input strokes as command strokes. Importantly, an insertion point on the first touchscreen area and a scrolling control area in the second touchscreen area move in unison to the left as characters are entered. The present invention is directed to more efficient character and text recognition and editing on a handheld portable computer system. One of the problems with the prior art methods for character and text recognition is that a user’s attention is directed to two separate areas of the touchscreen – one for text and stroke recognition where characters are inputted, and one for command stroke recognition where menu and icon manipulation takes place. Consequently, the user is always checking back and forth between the two touchscreen areas resulting in inefficient text entry. See Specification page 4. The present invention proposes a method whereby a portion of recognized and just entered text appears in the touchscreen area reserved for recognizing text entry and is saved as a recognition history. Therefore, the user’s focus can simply be on the one area of the touchscreen reserved for text entry.

By contrast, Takahashi is directed to a pen input processing apparatus for use on a conventional computer processing machine. Importantly, Takahashi does not teach or suggest that recognized text comprises a recognition history. Instead, Takashi teaches a simple conventional display area coupled with a display screen (see Takahashi reference numeral 21 in column 10 lines 47-60).

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

The shortcomings of the base reference are not overcome by Beernink or Edwards. Beernink is directed to correction in a pen-based computer. Beernink fails to disclose a second touchscreen area is configured for “recognizing input strokes as command strokes” as is required under claim 5. Edwards is directed to a display editing system for grouping freeform stylus strokes into one or more segments on a display. However, Edwards fails to disclose the step of “moving the insertion point and the scroll control area in unison to the left.”

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 5 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 3 and 9, by their dependency on amended claim 5, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24:

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of Lui. Applicant has amended claims 5, 15 and 22 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicant has amended independent claim 5 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 5 has been amended to recite the step of “moving the insertion point and the scroll control area in unison to the left.” Claim 15 has been similarly amended to recite the step of “moving the insertion point and the scroll control area in unison to the left.” Claim 22 has been amended to recite the step of “moving the insertion point and the scroll control area in unison to the left.”

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Similarly, claims 15 and 22 are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, and

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

Edwards since none of the references teaches or suggests the step of “moving the insertion point and the scroll control area in unison to the left.”

Lui fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 5, 15 and 22 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2, 13, 20 and 24, by their dependency on amended claims 5, 15 and 22 respectively, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim 4:

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of Cobbley.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Cobbley fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Cobbley does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 5 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 4, by its dependency on amended claim 5, is similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claims 6, 8, 10 and 11:

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of Berman.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Berman fails

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Berman does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 5 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 6, 8, 10 and 11, by their dependency on amended claim 5, is similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim 7:

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards in view of Bennett.

As discussed above, Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards with respect to the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, and Edwards. Bennett fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi and Beernink. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Bennett does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 5 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 7, by its dependency on amended claim 5, is similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim 14:

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in further view of Cobbley.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24, claim 15 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Cobbley fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Therefore,

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, Lui and Cobbley does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 14, by its dependency on amended claim 15, is similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16 and 18:

The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in view of Berman.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24, claim 15 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Berman fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, Lui and Berman does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 16 and 18, by their dependency on amended claim 15, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17:

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in view of Bennett.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24, claim 15 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Bennett fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, Lui and

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

Bennett does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 17, by its dependency on amended claim 15, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim 19:

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui in view of Marianetti.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 2, 13, 15, 20 22 and 24, claim 15 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Marianetti fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, and Lui. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Takahashi, Beernink, Edwards, Lui and Marianetti does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 19, by its dependency on amended claim 15, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 09/872,245
Response dated: March 19, 2007
Reply to the Office Action of: December 19, 2006

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: March 19, 2007

By: _____

Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860